



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

synonym of *Gloiotrichia echinulata*. Richter's distinction of *Gloiotrichia echinulata* and *G. Pisum* is adopted by Kirchner in Engler & Prantl's Pflanzenfamilien (1^{1a}: 90. 1898).

Dr. A. Schmidt, in a paper * known to the writer only through a notice in Just's Jahresbericht,† protests against Richter's union of *Rivularia fluitans* and *Gloiotrichia echinulata*. Some remarks on *Rivularia fluitans* by Dr. Schmidt are published in the Verhandlungen des Botanischen Vereins der Provinz Brandenburg for 1897 (39: xxxi-xxxiv).

"Observations upon some Algae which cause 'Water Bloom'" ‡ is the title of a recent paper by N. P. B. Nelson, dealing with the plants concerned in "water-bloom" as it occurs in Minnesota.

It is to be hoped that subsequent collections of the supposed *Gloiotrichia echinulata* in the Adirondack region may result in securing spore-bearing specimens, which will afford a more satisfactory basis for comparison with closely related or identical forms of Europe and of our western States.

EXCERPTS FROM DR. OTTO KUNTZE'S NOMENCLATURAE BOTANICAE CODEX BREVIS MATURUS §

It is a pity that our American botanical friends of U. S. A. practice promptly their new inconsiderate rules and neglect afterwards contrary facts. Thus they maintain their Rochester resolutions, although I proved in my Rev. III^{II}, § 28-30, that 20,000-30,000 names were still to be changed by these resolutions, which they, contrary to scientific principles, will not do. Formerly the Bulletin of the Torrey Botanical Club reported always about my Revisio gen. I/II, III^I, but about my Revisio

* Schrift. naturf. Ges. Danzig, 9: 27-31. 1898.

† Bot. Jahresb. 26¹: 294. 1900.

‡ Minn. Bot. Studies, 3: 51-56. pl. 14. 1903.

§ Nomenclaturae botanicae codex brevis maturus sensu codicis emendati aux Lois de la nomenclature botanique de Paris de 1867 linguis internationalibus: Anglica, gallica, germanica quoad nomina latina, auctore Otto Kuntze. Stuttgart, 1903. [Excerpts from English version, pp. XLVII-XLVIII, LV-LVII.]

III^{II}, indicating the facts against the Rochester resolutions, which I had sent them *ad referendum*, they did not refer. Then Professor Underwood abstained from all reports and critics in Bull. Torr. Club. But lately, in another publication of that Club, Torreya, such reports and critiques have begun anew, and the editors of the Bulletin having been changed, there is hope of amelioration and revocation of their incapable Rochester resolutions.

* * * * * * * * *

It may not be forgotten that there is now more danger than ever for the international nomenclature by four cliques.

1. The clique of Engler, who scoffs at the regulation by a Congress (Rev. gen. III^{II}, page 68) renouncing to have his rules sanctioned by a "so-called" general botanic Congress. Nevertheless he was "elected" with eight of his collaborators into the second international commission for the Congress, though by a mysterious manner. One of his collaborators (Briquet) has caused or participated to the arrangement of that falsified commission, and another of his collaborators (R. von Wettstein) has caused or participated to give illegal right of voting to the members of this commission in favor of Engler. English and American botanists did not receive the circulars for the Congress in English language and were thus repulsed from a Congress that could thereby become partial. See also ABZ. 1902: 164.

2. The Kew clique, which recognizes only the Kew Index. The present director of the Royal Kew Herbarium and Gardens, Sir William Thiselton Dyer, is perfectly innocent as to the servile Kew Index with its Kew obscuration principle and Kew falsification principle (see note 27, page xlviii), because Sir William never was a collaborator of the Kew Index. Even he declared its names as no standard ones. In a presidential address given at Ipswich in 1895 in the botanic section of the British Association (see Journal of Botany, 1896: 306), he had proclaimed: "It is a mistake to suppose that the Kew Index expresses any opinion as to the validity of the names themselves." But when I invited him to attach himself to international tendencies of nomenclature I received the strange answer: "We have our own nomencla-

ture." Thereby he comes in contradiction with himself and his former proclamation. Likewise Mr. D. Jackson and Mr. Th. Durand, as editors of the supplement to the Kew Index, refuse in its prospectus to acknowledge the nomenclature of the Index Kewensis. That index is only a good work for quotations with a systematic somewhat out of date, but with slight value as to nomenclature. In the new supplements all misnames of plants from all authors are quoted without but all from the bulk of such misnames given by Jackson and by Durand; that is also not in harmony with scientific exactitude. Moreover, the Kew Index is pretty unreliable and incomplete. (See *Journal of Botany*, 1896: 298-307; *Deutsche bot. Wochenschrift*, 1899: 4-7; *Allgemeine Botan. Zeitschrift*, 1902: 98 bis 100, 1903: 101-105; *Botan. Centralblatt*, XC: 685.)

3. The French clique Malinvaud-Le Jolis-Levier, who tried to charm away the priority out of the Paris Code (see *Rev. gen. III*^{II}: 13-14, 25-30, 43-58); but the priority is the base of that Code. One of these nomenclature-charmers Mr. Malinvaud, general secretary of the botanic society of France has caused (see *Le Monde des Plantes*, 1903: 21) that this society did not participate of the international commission for nomenclature "and that it has no part with an artificial agitation which menaces to end with the bankrupt of the laws of nomenclature." Well, it would scarcely be possible to expose more to shame these laws and the botanic society of France as Mr. Malinvaud has done it. Indeed that society as godmother of these laws of 1867 is obliged morally to take care of the further existence of these laws, which she has caused; but that will be impossible with Mr. Malinvaud, for that would be to set the fox to keep one's geese. The botanic society of France is rather obliged to participate directly of a reformation of the laws of botanical nomenclature. That these laws not be needy of reformation can only be pretended by men who do not know these laws by practice.

4. The clique of some Americans (see note 24) who maintain their inexecutable Rochester resolutions although it is proved that by these rules still 20,000-30,000 names are to be changed (see *Rev. gen. III*^{II} p. CCLXIV and *III*^{II}: 134-153 of the intro-

duction). If these American botanists would not attach themselves to international order, we can speak of a botanical Tammany-ring.

51*b*. Another perverter of nomenclature mentioned sub 51³ Dr. E. Levier, who even was elected — it is not known with how few votes and by whom — into the international commission, has discharged against me a pamphlet of 12 narrow printed pages, after that his last furious articles were refused from the *Bulletin de l'herbier Boissier* et from the *Botan. Centralblatt*.

I renounce, of course, to enter in details; I want only to hang deeper that pamphlet, as he had it sent to the members of the international commission and to my friends, such I could look in it. That doctor, whose capacity in nomenclature is to be seen by the fact that he, notwithstanding his interminable tittletattle, could not join an only paragraph to the laws, that doctor pretends that I had called him a "Schafskopf" (sheep's head). But the matter is, that he in a letter conditionally to be published had called himself a "Schafskopf," which denomination he falsified afterwards into "Schäfer" (shepherd) in the *Botan. Centralblatt* (see *Rev. gen.* III^{II}: 55). The conditions for the publication were honestly realized by him. I recognize therefore his honesty if arriving. But I had characterized him l. c. 58 as a *Verdreh-Genie* (genius in perverting), about which he prudently was silent.

In the combats that myself as the principal defender of the Paris Code had to fight since ten years against the widely spread corruption in botany, I met not rarely with such malefactors; their just and strong designation was only duty. That such designations occur several times is no wonder and nevermind a disculpation for a single malefactor.